excluſive judge, if woman partake with him the gift of reaſon?

In this ſtyle, argue tyrants of every denomination, from the weak king to the weak father of a family; they are all eager to cruſh reaſon; yet always aſſert that they uſurp its throne only to be uſeful. Do you not act a ſimilar part, when you *force* all women, by denying them civil and political rights, to remain immured in their families groping in the dark? for ſurely, Sir, you will not aſſert, that a duty can be binding which is not founded on reaſon? If indeed this be their deſtination, arguments may be drawn from reaſon: and thus auguſtly ſupported, the more underſtanding women acquire, the more they will be attached to their duty—comprehending it—for unleſs they comprehend it, unleſs their morals be fixed on the ſame immutable principle as thoſe of man, no authority can make them diſcharge it in a virtuous manner. They may be convenient ſlaves, but ſlavery will have its conſtant

conſtant effect, degrading the maſter and the abject dependent.

But, if women are to be excluded, without having a voice, from a participation of the natural rights of mankind, prove firſt, to ward off the charge of injuſtice and inconſiſtency, that they want reaſon—elſe this flaw in your NEW CONSTITUTION, the firſt conſtitution founded on reaſon, will ever ſhew that man muſt, in ſome ſhape, act like a tyrant, and tyranny, in whatever part of ſociety it rears its brazen front, will ever undermine morality.

I have repeatedly aſſerted, and produced what appeared to me irrefragable arguments drawn from matters of fact, to prove my aſſertion, that women cannot, by force, be confined to domeſtic concerns; for they will, however ignorant, intermeddle with more weighty affairs, neglecting private duties only to diſturb, by cunning tricks, the orderly plans of reaſon which riſe above their comprehenſion.